

THE
GENERATION
OF THE
SON of GOD,
As Taught in the
SCRIPTURES,
CONSIDER'D;
AND THE
CONSEQUENTS
Of it, as to his
UNITY of ESSENCE,
AND
EQUALITY with the FATHER,
EXAMIN'D. *Burnett*

By G. BURNETT, M. A.

L O N D O N :

Printed for JOHN CLARK, at the Bible and Crown
in the Poultry, near Cheapſide. M. DCC. XX.

Price 6d.

THE
ENTERTAINMENT

OF THE

THEATRE

OF THE



OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

THE
GENERATION
OF THE
SON of GOD,
As Taught in the
SCRIPTURES,
CONSIDER'D.

The principal QUESTION in the present Controversy briefly stated.

HE *Socinians* have long disputed, with much Subtilty, against the eternal Generation, Existence, and proper Deity of the Son of God; their Objections have been solidly answer'd, and Arguments sufficiently confuted: Others are now risen up, who, sensible that *Socinus's* Principles are not to be maintain'd, by dropping what in his Scheme is most plainly contrary to Scripture, viz. that Christ was not in being before his Formation in the Womb

of the blessed Virgin; that he was not begotten from Eternity; that he has no other than the Humane Nature, and is not properly God, seem to come nearer the Truth; tho', as to the last Particular, the present *Arians* differ only in Words from *Socinus*; the latter rightly judging a delegated Divinity, no proper one, whereas the other will have it to be so: but these, notwithstanding they own an eternal Generation, Existence, and proper Divinity, as they will have it call'd, of the Son, yet depart very far from the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints: and altho' they are not willing to bear the Name of *Arians*, yet they agree with them in what was a principal part of the old *Arian* Heresy, and does also necessarily infer what themselves will have to be the distinguishing Opinion of *Arius*; for if the Son be not one Essence with the Father, his Essence must be a created one, as I hope will sufficiently appear by what follows.

The principal Question in the present Debate, I take to be, Whether the Son of God, who was made Flesh, taking our Nature into a personal Union with himself, is one Essence, or Substance with the Father, or have a proper Essence of his own distinct from the others: Upon this the whole Dispute hangs; if the Son is one Essence with the Father, he must be Co-eternal, and Equal with him in Power and Glory; the most High, and the one true God, and is to be worshipped with the highest Adoration, equally with the Father: but if his Essence be really distinct from that of the Father, then must he have been made, and not begotten; yea made of nothing, as the ancient *Arians* asserted: On that Supposition he is truly infinitely inferior to the Father, is far from being the most high God, or deserving to be honour'd with the highest divine Worship. This, as I judge, is the Hinge of the Controversy, and is a Question of the highest

briefly stated.

est Moment: The Terms Son, and Begotten, seem to countenance the *Arian* side, I purpose therefore to examine, whether the second Person of the adorable Three, his being begotten by, or properly the Son to the First, contains any real Ground for the *Arian* Doctrine, or necessarily concludes for a Distinction of Essence, or essential Inequality, between them. That I may manage this Inquiry with the greater Clearness, I'll proceed in the following Method.

I. I'll offer a few Things, as some Account from the Scriptures, of the Son's eternal Generation.

II. Shew that there is really nothing in that Mystery, that infers the Son's having an Essence distinct from, or inferior to that of the Father.

III. Prove on the contrary, that because the second Person is the Son, and begotten of the First, he must have the same Essence and Substance with him, and so be equal with him in Power and Glory.

I. Some Account must be given of the eternal Generation of the Son, as the Foundation of what is to ensue; if nothing at all of this be known, neither side of the Question can be infer'd from it. As to that then take the following Particulars.

1. The Generation of the second Person in the Godhead is a very great Mystery, and far above the reach of our Minds, at least in this Estate, to comprehend; that it would be Presumption for any Man to pretend to give a perfect and full Explication of it: * *Who shall declare his generation?* It becomes us therefore here to be very modest: We are not able to open fully the Mysteries of Nature; the Generation of any natural Things: Who can tell † *how*

* *Isai. liii. 8.*

† *Eccles. xi. 5.*

the bones grow in the womb of her that is with child? and shall we pretend to comprehend the Mysteries of the Godhead, or the Generation of the Son of God, We are far from understanding the most obvious things of Nature perfectly, and shall we attempt to fathom the latent Depths of the infinite Creator? We are but of Yesterday, and know nothing even of our selves perfectly, and shall we think to comprehend the eternal Being? Shall they who know so little of his Works in Time, and in their own Day, attempt to unfold his Wonders from Eternity? † “*Hic vox fileat, mens deficit, non tantum mea, sed etiam Angelorum.*” The Generation of the Son of God may well with Silence be admir'd, in which will remain unfathomable Mysteries, when we have said and thought all that we are able: In this Matter especially we need to take the divine Oracles for our Guide, and go no farther, move no faster than they lead us: To think or speak of what is so high and mysterious, without the Light and Direction of the Word, is very dangerous. Reason, unassisted by Revelation, would never have thought of any such thing; it is observ'd, * that there are Prints of an ancient Tradition in the World, of three in the Godhead, call'd the Word, or the Wisdom; and the Spirit, or the Love: beside the Fountain of both these, God. This, adds the same Author, was believ'd by those from whom the ancient Philosophers had their Doctrines; but doubtless such a Tradition must have had its rise from Revelation: We may judge in some measure by Reason what the Generation of the Son is not; but our positive Knowledge of it must be had from a positive Divine Revelation.

† Turret. Institut. l. 3. Quæst. 19.

* Burnet 39. Artic.

2. The Scriptures teach us but little of the manner of the Son's Generation; and opens this Mystery so sparingly, as if it were the design of God in this Instance to exercise our Faith, rather than satisfy our Reason. That the second Person in the Godhead was begotten from Eternity by the First, is so fully declar'd, that without Violence done the sacred Text, it can't be denied: The Terms of Father and Son, mention'd so frequently in the lively Oracles, with Reference to the first and second Persons in the Godhead, are relative, expressing the Relations of Paternity and Filiation; both which are ground'd upon, and necessarily suppose Generation: But then as to the Manner how the Father begets, or the Son is begotten, the Wisdom of God hath thought fit to leave us in some Obscurity: nor are we to think it strange that God has dealt thus with Men; shall not the most High be at liberty to reveal himself to his Creatures as far as he pleaseth, and when he pleaseth also to make a stop? May not God acquaint us that there is a Father and Son in the Godhead, unless he likewise inform us of the Manner of the Son's Generation? The plain Testimony of God should oblige us to believe this, and the like Mysteries, tho' we are not able to comprehend them: Surely nothing is more agreeable to right Reason, than that, if God is pleas'd to reveal, that there is in the Godhead one that begetteth, another that is begotten, and a third who proceeds from both the former, we should believe accordingly; altho' we cannot conceive either how the Son is begotten by the Father; or the Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son.

3. Though the Nature, or the Manner of the Son's Generation be not revealed, so as to be clearly and fully understood by us; yet does the Scripture give some Hints about it, from which all our Knowledge of that Mystery must be deriv'd: Several things

things there are that may help us to conceive something of this Matter. Those Words of Christ concerning himself, *John* 5. 26. the Denominations of the *Word* and *Wisdom*, us'd of him, and the Description or Character given of him, *Hebr.* 1. 2. are all serviceable to the said Purpose. To consider them distinctly.

(1.) That Text in *St. John*, *As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself*, seems to express this Mystery above any thing else in the Word, being as it were a Paraphrase on Generation; and how could that have been open'd, or how can we conceive it better, than as here it is set forth, to be the Son's having it given to him of the Father, *to have Life in himself*? When the second Person in the adorable Trinity had it given unto him of the First, to have Life in himself, then, and thereby was he begotten of him. More distinctly two Things are here asserted of the Son. *First*, That he hath Life in himself, and even as the Father. *Secondly*, That it is given unto him by the Father to have Life in himself. Both these are expressly in the Text. The Son, if Christ himself is to be credited, hath Life in himself; a Proposition of greatest importance, and which alone is sufficient to subvert the *Arian* Scheme; for if it be thus, as most certainly it is, however it came to be so, the Son must be one Essence with the Father; inasmuch as nothing besides the absolutely perfect Essence of the one most high God, can have Life in itself; for what is the Import of this, *having Life in himself*? But that Life is essential to him, that he is the Fountain, the Source, and Original of Life, and as such the absolute Lord of it. Now what, but absolute Perfection, or the infinite Essence of the one most high God, can be said to be the Source and Original of Life? And who, but he that is the Original and Fountain,

Fountain, can be the absolute Lord of Life? Certainly, to have life in himself is something more than barely to be a vital, living Being; were that all the meaning of that Expression, no more would be ascrib'd to Christ therein, than what is true of every Man, we have Life: but the Life which we have, we have not in our selves, but in God, in whom we both * *live, and move*, as well as *have our being*: Such an Expression as this is never us'd of any Man, or any created Being; it is spoken of Christ, as something peculiar to the Son of God, and a transcendent Excellency: It is also a great deal more, than to have a Power over Life given unto him, so as by the Power of the most High, to be able to raise the Dead to life, either in a natural or spiritual Sense: For, suppose that were all, he could not be said to have that Power in himself, or Life in himself, upon the account of such a Power, in as much as the Power producing Life, or giving Life to the dead is on this Supposition foreign, not inherent in him; not his own, but the Power of the most High: and if he has not the Power in himself, he can't have the Life in himself that is produc'd by that Power: The Apostles had a Power given them over † *unclean Spirits*, over *all manner of Diseases*, yea to *raise the dead*; but are they ever said, upon that account, to have Strength in themselves for such things, or to have the casting out of Devils, or healing of the Sick, or Life in themselves? Do they ever assume this to themselves? On the contrary they ‡ disclaim'd it, and by no means would allow others to ascribe it to them. This Expression then imports more than his having a Power to raise or quicken the dead; such a Power others had, who yet could not be said to have Life in themselves; in as much as the Power, whereby

* Acts xvii. 28.

† Matth. x. 1, 8.

‡ Acts iii. 12.

8 *Some Account of the Son's Generation*

they rais'd the dead, was not inherent in them; it was not their Power, but that of the most high God. Nor will it avail to say, that the Power of the most high God was communicated unto the Son, upon the *Arian* Principle; for by such a Communication, that Power is either made truly and properly the Son's, and inherent in him, or it is not; if the latter, then that Communication will not make him to have Life in himself, because notwithstanding that, the Power, whereby on this Supposition he gives Life, is still foreign unto him; but if the Communication allow'd, be such as to make the Power communicated, truly and properly the Son's, and inherent in him, then must the Essence of the most high God be communicated to the Son; because the Power of the most high God, can be properly and truly his only, that has the Nature and Essence of the most High; surely the Power of the most high God can only inhere in his own most perfect Essence; and be natural only to him, who is Partaker of that: So that a Communication of this Nature destroys their own Scheme: I say, that the Son's *having Life in himself*, denotes more than his having a Power to give Life, by such a Communication of the Power of the most high God to him, as our *Arians* allow: it imports no less, than that he is the original Possessor of Life; and as such the absolute Lord of it: Thus much seems to be necessary for the end of that Assertion, which is to confirm what was said in the preceding Verse, *viz. That the Hour was coming, and then was, when the dead should hear the Voice of the Son of God, and they that heard should live*: To which is added, *For as the Father hath Life in himself, so hath he given to the Son* — *q.d.* Do ye desire a Confirmation, or want a Proof of what I say, *viz. that the dead shall hear my Voice and live*, or that they who believe in me shall have everlasting Life? Know then

To *Some Account of the Son's Generation*

of the adorable Three has the absolutely perfect Divine Essence; which is communicated by the one

then that as the Father, even so I have in me the Fountain, the Original, and Source of Life; and therefore am able to give Life unto whom I will. Besides the same thing is meant by the Son's *having Life in himself*, as by the Father's *having Life in himself*: Now doubtless *having Life in himself*, apply'd to the Father, signifies his having in him, or being the Fountain and Original of Life, and that essentially: this therefore must be the Import of it in the latter part of the Verse, where it is applied to the Son; now that, as was observ'd before, is no less than to have the absolutely perfect Essence of the one most high God; for only that is the Fountain and Original of Life: and who can have Life in himself as the Father hath, without either having the Father's Essence, or one equally perfect? It is impossible that there should be any other Essence or Nature as perfect as that of the most High: he therefore that hath Life in himself as the Father, must have the very Essence of the Father: And once more, he that hath Life in himself must have it essentially; *i. e.* from the Perfection of his Nature and Essence: Now the Nature and Essence that has Life in it self, must be absolutely perfect; and as there can be but one Nature or Essence absolutely perfect, that must be the Essence of the one most high God: Upon the whole, by the Text under Consideration, the Son has in him the Fountain, Original, and Source of Life; he lives by the Perfection of his Nature, and therefore must have an absolutely perfect Essence; which is the Essence of the one most high God alone.

The other thing asserted in this Verse, is how the Son comes to have *Life in himself*, or the infinite Essence of the one most high God; which *having Life in himself* necessarily requires, and supposeth: As to this, we are told that it is given to him of the Father; it is of the first, that the second Person

B 2

of

was clothed with a Vesture dipt in Blood, and his Name is called, the Word of God. From the Description that's given in this last place, of the Per-

vine Essence; which is communicated by the one unto the other in such manner as is consistent with its Perfection; and in such a manner likewise as that necessarily requires; as shall be shewn by and by: This giving is such, as makes the first Person, or the Giver, a Father; the second, or him to whom it is given, a Son; viz: by an act of Generation: As the Son is a Divine Person, having the infinite Essence of the one most high God, he is such by his being begotten of the Father: Thus then we may conceive, from the Word, of the Nature of the Son's Generation; * it is his having it given to him, of the Father, to *have Life in himself*; or his having the Essence of the one most high God communicated to him, *i.e.* made by the first, to subsist in a second Person, viz. the Son: When the first Person in the adorable Trinity made, that the infinite Divine Essence did subsist in a second, then, and thereby did he beget the Son, and was properly a Father; then, and thereby was the second begotten, and properly a Son. This, I apprehend, the Scripture means by the Son's eternal Generation. What farther Assistance it gives us to conceive how the infinite Divine Essence is made by the first to subsist in a second Person, will appear,

2. By two Denominations of the Son therein; which in some measure serve to open that Mystery; viz. *the Word*, and *Wisdom*. These are Names given in Scripture to the Son, and that, I think, upon the account of his eternal Generation; and by consequence may give us some Light into it.

The first we find frequently us'd of him. *John 1. 1. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Sometimes he is called the *Word of God*. *Rev. 19. 13. He*

* Wit. in Symb. Exercit. 12.

was

12 *Some Account of the Son's Generation*

whereby our Conceptions and internal Reasonings are expressed to others; but also *sermo internus*, or these Conceptions and Reasonings themselves

Name is called, *the Word of God*. From the Description that's given in this last place, of the Person spoken of, and call'd the *Word of God*, it is evident that it is the Son, or the Lord Jesus Christ that's there describ'd: and that it is the same who is spoken of in the Gospel by the Name of *the Word*, is also plain enough to any that reads the Context: It is observable that St. *John*, in the first of those places, is treating of Christ in respect of his Divine Nature; for he comes not to speak of his Humanity till ψ . 11. So that this Name is given him as the eternal Son of God, and speaks, as some think, his personal Subsistence; as his being, in the beginning, his eternal Existence: Whether he has this Name from his Office, or not, is not very evident; certain it is, that by the Son, the Father is made known; * *No Man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any Man the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.* † *God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the Fathers, by the Prophets, bath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.* That as our Words manifest our Thoughts and Minds unto others; so does the Son reveal the Father: But if that be any Reason of this Denomination, yet it is not the only one, nor the principal: Had the Son never revealed the Father, yet might he have bore this Name, upon the account of his eternal Generation: And to intimate something of that I judge it is given: Words are as it were generated in our Minds, or Thoughts; they are brought forth by the Tongue, but are conceiv'd and begotten in our Mind; so the Son of God is begotten in the Father's infinite Mind: But $\lambda\gamma\omega$ signifies not only *verbum*, or *sermo externus*, the Words of our Lips,

* Matth. xi. 27.

† Heb. i. 1, 2.

whereby

from the SACRED SCRIPTURES.

15

requires it; because an infinite Being can't but comprehend himself most perfectly; and that Compre-

are exprest to others; but also *sermo internus*, or those Conceptions and Reasonings themselves; which as they are from the Mind, begotten by it; so are a sort of internal Images of the Mind, of which they come, and in which they are; the Son is the eternal, personal and essential λογος, or Conception of the Father's Mind; to clear this, we are to remember that God himself is the primary Object of his own Knowledge; that he knows all other things in himself; besides he knows, conceives, and comprehends himself, and all things in himself, by and in one Act or Conception of his infinite Understanding; moreover that Conception, whereby the blessed God comprehends himself by reason of his infinite, or absolute Perfection, must be his Essence; for the infinite God does not conceive, as we do, by Acts distinct from his Essence, but by his Essence it self: The other way is proper to Creatures, and implies Imperfection; which therefore cannot agree to God: Thus then the Son seems to have the Essence of the Father communicated to him, or to be begotten, viz. by the Father's most perfect and essential Conception of himself, by which the Divine Essence is made to subsist in a second Person, and by this we perceive the Divine Essence subsisting two different Ways; one, in this essential Conception of himself; and another, in the Conceiver, and Original of this Conception: Now the Divine Essence subsisting in a different manner, makes a distinct Person; it's true, the same numerical created Essence cannot subsist in distinct Persons; the Imperfection of all created Essences will not allow it; but we are not to conclude from this, that the Divine Essence, which is absolutely perfect, tho' a singular Essence, cannot subsist in distinct Persons: yea the absolute Perfection of the Divine Essence not only makes it capable of subsisting so, but also requires

requires it; because an Infinite Being can't but comprehend himself most perfectly; and that Comprehension of himself must be his Essence; which therefore subsisteth in the Comprehender, and in the essential Conception, whereby he is comprehended; and differently in each; which, as I said, makes distinct Persons.

The term *Wisdom*, whereby the Son is also denominated, intimates likewise the same. Thus he's called, *Prov. 8. 1, &c.* That Wisdom there is a Person, and the Son appears from the things ascrib'd to him: It is the Wisdom, that ** crieth, and putteth forth her Voice*; and who is it that stands, knocks and calls at Sinners Doors, but Christ? It is the Wisdom, that *standeth in the top of high places, by the way, in the places of the paths: that crieth at the Gates, at the entry of the City, at the coming in at the Doors*: And whom should this be applied unto, but him, who, on the great Day of the Feast, stood and cried, saying, *† If any Man thirst, let him come unto me and drink*? It is the Wisdom, by whom Kings reign, and Princes decree *Righteousness*: And who should that be, rather than the Person, whose Vesture and Thigh bear this Inscription, *† King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*? It's that Wisdom who hath a special Concernment for the Children of Men, that *rejoic'd in the habitable Parts of the Earth*, and had his Delights with the human Race when the Foundations of the World were laid; and who can that be, but he ** Who loved, and washed us in his own Blood*, even Jesus, *† Who for the Joy that was set before him, endured the Cross, despising the Shame, and is set down at the right hand of the Throne of God*? So that there is good Reason

* Rev. iii. 14, 20.

† John vii. 37.

‡ Rev. xix. 16.

* Rev. i. 5.

† Heb. xii. 2.

14 *Some Account of the Son's Generation*

to conclude, *the Wisdom*, here spoken of, to be a Person, even the Son of God: And why is he call'd *Wisdom* but from the manner of his Generation, which is hereby limited to us; especially, at least, upon that account? It is very certain, and doubtless will be confess'd by all, that the second Person in the Godhead does not excel the others in Understanding and Knowledge; that he should have this Name from any Eminency of Wisdom above the Father, and the Spirit: However if any do imagin that the Son is superior to the Spirit in Wisdom, they will not pretend that he excels the Father in that, any more than in any other account: nor has the Son this Name, because the Wisdom of God is eminently manifested in and through him: I readily grant that the manifold Wisdom of God appears marvelously, and in a singular manner, in the Lord Jesus Christ; in his Person, as God-man; in his Office, as Mediator; and in the Redemption wrought by him; but this Name seems to be given to the Son, upon the account of what he then was: A great while before his Incarnation, or the Wisdom of God was manifested in the Constitution of *Emanuel*: It is given him as the eternal Son of God; and which he might have had, tho' he had never undertaken the Office of Mediator: it is taken from his Nature, not his Work: The Goodness of God is as marvelously display'd in Christ, as his *Wisdom*: So are likewise his Holiness, and Justice; he's said to be ** set forth to be a Propitiation through Faith, in his Blood, to declare God's Righteousness*. So that the Son might as well be call'd Goodness, or Holiness, or Righteousness, manifestatively as Wisdom; and were that the Ground of this Denomination, we might expect to find him also denominated from the other Perfections, display'd likewise through

* Rom. iii. 25.

him in a singular manner: but where in all the sacred Oracles is Christ term'd Goodness, because divine Mercy is manifested unto Men thro' him? or Holiness, because the Father's Name is eminently sanctified in him? or Justice, for his being set forth to declare the Righteousness of God? or Faithfulness, for this reason, that all the Promises are Yea, and *Amen* in him? And seeing that he has not a Name from any of these Perfections of God, which are manifested wonderfully in, and thorough him, as well as Wisdom; there's reason to conclude; that when the Son is call'd Wisdom, it is upon some other account, than that the Wisdom of God is manifested in and by him: and what then can be the ground of this Name, but the manner of his eternal Generation, *viz.* by the Father's most perfect conception or knowledge of himself? *Cognoscendo seipsum genuit (Pater) Filium.* And how should Wisdom be begotten, rather than by the Father's essential conception of himself? Or what can deserve to be called Wisdom, rather than the infinite God's most perfect Knowledge and Comprehension of himself? Very agreeably to this it is said of Christ, that all the Treasures of Wisdom and * Knowledge are hid in him. Surely the Father's Comprehension of his Infinite self, must include all Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge. By both these Denominations then the same thing is intimated, *viz.* the Son's eternal Generation by the Father's most perfect Knowledge of himself: in that necessary Comprehension of himself, which is essential to the divine Being, or to the first Person in the Godhead, the divine Essence subsists in a different manner from that in the first; and thereby the second, *viz.* the Son, is begotten; which perfectly answers, and may also receive some confirmation from,

* Cor. ii. 3.

3. The Character or Description given of the Son, *Hebr. i. 2. Who being the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his Person.* If the Son is the brightness of the Father's Glory, is it like that his essential Glory should be inferior to the Father's? The brightness of Glory must denote the excellency. The height, or rather the infinity of the Father's Glory; that I see not how it could have been more emphatically told us, that the Son hath all the Glory of the Father, and by consequence, is not inferior to him in Glory, than by saying, that he is the brightness of his Glory; would it not be very strange, and unfit to say of one infinitely inferior to another, (as the Son must be in respect of the Father, if not the same Essence with him) that he is the brightness of that other's Glory? Can he be the brightness of another's Glory, who is infinitely less glorious than the other? Let it be observ'd, that the Apostle is here describing the personal, and proper Glory of the Son; that he might shew how excellent and glorious a Person the Gospel High-Priest is; and therefore the Expression must be understood, as setting forth the essential Perfection of the Son; that in his Nature and Essence he is so far from being in the least inferior to the Father, that all the Perfection of the Father, even his most shining Glory is in him: the Words I say are to be taken, as signifying, that the brightness of the Father's Glory is Essential to the Son, and not only that it is manifested by him; for thus understood, they answer not the Author's design; what is it to the personal Excellency of the Redeemer, that the Glory of the most high God is most brightly manifested by him? He might in his own Person and Nature be mean enough, and nothing superior either to the Prophets, by whom God had spoken to the Fathers, or to the legal Priests; and God, notwithstanding, he pleased to make the largest and most perfect discoveries

coveries of himself through him; but it is the other part of that Description which is chiefly to the present purpose. *The express Image of his Person*; this, as I hinted, answers perfectly to what was said of the manner of his Generation, and is some confirmation of that; the Father's most perfect, necessary, and essential Conception can't but fully answer his absolute Perfection, or be a perfect Image of him; and what can deserve to be call'd the express Image of the Father's Person, rather than such a conception or knowledge of himself? The original Word * signifies the Form of one thing impress'd upon another, so as that the Impression fully and exactly represents the Form of the thing it is made by; as when Wax is impressed by a Seal, the Form or Engraving of the Seal is express'd in the Wax; and the impression in the Wax fully answers the Figure of the Seal; or is the express Image, or *χαρακτὴρ* of it; accordingly that Essential conception of himself in the Father, whereby the divine Essence subsisteth in a second Person, must adequately correspond to the absolute Perfection of the divine Essence, or Being; and all the Excellency, every Perfection of the Father must be fully and most perfectly represented therein: as if a Man were able, in one Idea, to comprehend all his own Parts, all the Powers and Faculties of his Soul, all the Members of his Body, and all the Parts of every Member; together with all the Virtues and Powers arising from his Frame and Constitution; so that there were not any Part, or any Faculty and Power uncomprehended therein; such an Idea would be a most perfect Image of the Man, and seem to be another himself: It's true that no Man is able to form so perfect a Conception; yet none will deny, or doubt but that the infinite

* *Χαρακτὴρ*.

Mind is able to do this, and must also at once comprehend the infinite divine Essence; so as to view fully the infinity of the divine Glory, and every Perfection included under it: as the Son therefore is begotten of the Father by such a perfect Conception of himself, he must be, as here stil'd by the inspir'd Author, the express Image, or *χαρακτὴρ* of his Person. Nor is it, I think, imaginable how the Son should be the express Image of the Father's Person, unless he were thus begotten of him; how should all and every one of the Perfections of the infinite God be fully and perfectly answer'd in the Son; so that to know either the Father or the Son, should be to know both, if it were not so? * *He that hath seen me, saith Christ, hath seen the Father*; which could not be if he were not thus the express Image of his Person, thus begotten of the Father, and had not his Essence. It ought to be noted, that there is a great difference between the most Blessed and infinite God's comprehending himself, and our Conceptions and Ideas of our selves; there's nothing like Generation in the acting of our Understanding, or in our Conception of our selves, but it is otherwise in the divine Understanding; for God, as was said above, knows himself not, as we do, by acts distinct from, but by his Essence: So that God's Comprehension of himself, as it is an express Image of him, so it is an essential Image, and therefore a distinct Person; but if it be asked, how the act of the Father's Understanding should beget, or be a second divine Person? I answer, that the Scriptures say nothing as to that, and therefore we must be content to be ignorant of it; where the Scripture is altogether silent, in such Mysteries as this, we ought to be so: we have but dark and very imper-

* John xiv. 9.

fect Apprehensions of God's essential Knowledge, or of his Manner of conceiving of himself; that it must be by his Essence, and not by Acts distinct from that we see clearly enough; but are not able to form any clear and perfect Conception of such a Manner of knowing; nor is it any wonder, seeing God dwells in inaccessible Light: Who can search out the Almighty to Perfection? Upon the whole then, from the Sacred Canon, the Son's eternal Generation seems to be, his having it given him to have Life in himself, *i. e.* Having it given him to be God, the most simple and infinite divine Essence subsisting in him, in another Manner than in the Father; it being of the First that the divine Essence does subsist in a Second Person, or in a different Manner than in himself; the Second is very truly and properly said to be thereby begotten by him, the First is thereby properly a Father, and the Second properly a Son. The Father is God, the Son also is God; the same God, though not the same Person with the Father; the Father is God of himself, the Son God of the Father; the Father has it not given to him by any to be God, whereas the Son has it given to him of the Father to be God, and God co-essential with the Father; it being of him that the divine Essence subsisteth in a Second Person, or in the Son. Moreover, as to the Manner of the Son's having it given to him to be God, or of the divine Essence, its subsisting in a Second Person, or that of the Son, from the same sacred Fountain, we are let to understand, that it is by the Father's most perfect Knowledge or Conception of himself; in which the divine Essence necessarily subsisteth in another Manner than in the Father, in that he is call'd the Word, and Wisdom, and is describ'd to be the *express Image of the Father's Person*, as well as *the Brightness of his Glory*. And if this be the Scripture Account of the Son's Generation,

neration, the following Observations, I think, will be very just.

1. This Generation of the Son of God was not a free and voluntary, but a necessary Act: To assert the first, is to affirm that the Son might not have been; that the Father might never have been a Father; and to make the Son of the Number of contingent Things, whose Beings depend upon the sovereign Pleasure of another, and of consequence a mere Creature: For whatsoever depends, for its Being, upon the sovereign Will of another, must be a Creature, in what Manner soever it is produc'd, and how excellent soever it is. The Generation of the Son, as it hath been explain'd, is as necessary as God himself; for Self-comprehension is as essential to an absolutely perfect Being, as Existence; so that the Son is as necessary as the Father; and could never not have been, any more than he: Indeed an unnecessary God, or a God whom Being is not necessary and essential unto, is a very strange Conception: Yet such Inconsistencies Men can digest, being of their own making, and the Consequents of their own Schemes; whereas the Mysteries of the Gospel are rejected, for less Incongruities, which they, without Ground, imagine are contain'd in them: But thus is the Wisdom of Men made Foolishness; who would make the Wisdom of God in the Gospel so; according to what St. Paul observes, 1 Cor. i. 20. *Where is the wise Man? Where is the Scribe? Where is the Disputer of this World? Hath not God made foolish the Wisdom of this World! &c. 25. Because the Foolishness of God is wiser than Men.*

2. The Generation of the Son, as it was necessary, is likewise Eternal; this is a Consequent of the former, and also follows immediately from the manner of this Generation; for that which ever was not, cannot exist necessarily; that which ever

was

was not in Being, might never have come into Being; because its Existence and Being must depend upon the sovereign Pleasure of another, and so does not exist necessarily: That then which exists necessarily, must have been for Ever, or Eternal. Besides, as Self-comprehension is necessary to an absolutely perfect Being, the Father must comprehend himself from Eternity, and therefore from Eternity beget his Son. * *Wisdom was in being before the Foundations of the World; the Lord possessed me in the beginning of his Ways, before his Works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the Earth was. When there were no Depths, I was brought forth: When there were no Fountains abounding with Water. Before the Mountains were settled, before the Hills was I brought forth. Thus speaks Wisdom of himself. And the Prophet, speaking of the Messiah, to be born in the Fulness of Time, at Bethlehem, adds, that † his going forth had been from of old, from everlasting. A twofold going forth of the Ruler of Israel, is plainly there mentioned, one that was then to come, ‡ — One of thee shall he come forth unto me — The Evangelist has explain'd the Prophet in this, by applying it to the Birth of the Messiah; who was born of the blessed Virgin, many Years after this Prediction, in Bethlehem: But besides this, there is another going forth of that Ruler mentioned, viz. One that had been long before, even as ancient as Eternity, — Whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting — He that was to be born at Bethlehem, in the appointed Time, as the Son of Man, had, as the Son of God, gone forth or been, begotten from everlasting. He was in the beginning, and is said to be the Alpha and Omega. ¶ He*

* Prov. viii. 22, &c.

† Micah v. 2.

‡ Matt. ii. 6.

¶ Rev. i. 8, 18.

is, and was, and is to come. So that the Son is eternal, as well as the Father, and co-eternal with him: Being, as I have shewn, begotten by the Father's most perfect Comprehension of himself. Some, who have thought fit to depart from the receiv'd Doctrine, of the Trinity of Persons in the God-head, seem to own, that the Son is begotten from Eternity; and yet will not allow him to be co-eternal with the Father: But what an Eternity must the Son's be, if the Father be of a more ancient Duration than he? They say he was before Time, and so from Eternity: It's true that the Son was before Time; but how could he be so upon their Principle, seeing Time really began when he was begotten? For certainly, as soon as any Being existed, that was not from all Eternity, then did Time begin; then began a successive Duration; and a successive Duration is Time: So that if the Son is not from all Eternity, he was not before Time; because on that Supposition, Time began with him; and if Time began with him, he could not be before it. Moreover, that which is from Everlasting, must be from all Eternity: Nor can that be from Everlasting, which had any thing before it. That Wisdom is from Everlasting, is very plain from the Places already quoted out of the Sacred Text: Christ is also call'd, * *The Everlasting Father*, i. e. The Everlasting God, the Creator of all. Now if the Son is the *Everlasting Father*, if he is from Everlasting, his duration must be without Beginning. We are not then to think, that because the Son is begotten of the Father, the Father is older than the Son, or of longer Duration than he; for although it is necessary in the natural Generation, that the Father be before the Son, it is not so in the divine Generation: The Son of God was begotten

* Isai. ix. 6.

from

from Eternity, and necessarily so; and seeing there can be no Priority, or Posterity in Eternity, the Son, who is Eternal, must be Co-eternal with the Father: To say that the Son is Eternal, and yet that the Father is of ancients Duration than he, is to assert and deny the same thing: If the Son is truly Eternal, he is without Beginning; and nothing can be prior unto that which is without Beginning. Besides, unless the Father could be before he comprehended himself, he could not be before the Son, who is begotten by his most perfect Comprehension of himself; and who will say that the infinite God, an absolutely perfect Being, can be without a Comprehension of himself?

3. By this Generation, the Son is not separated from the Father; he's begotten by him, and in him. The Son is really a distinct Person from the Father; he mediates between the Father and us: The Father was not incarnate, but the Son; and 'tis not the Father, but the Son, that is the Propitiation for our Sins; he is likewise an Advocate with the Father: All which proves the Father and the Son to be distinct Persons. The same is implied in the Son's being the express Image of the Father's Person: For tho' the Impression fully and exactly answers that which it is made by, yet it is really distinct from it; and seeing he is the Image of the Father's Person he must be distinct from him: For the Image and the Original cannot be in every respect the same. This likewise appears from his being sent, and given of the Father; surely the Father did not send himself; accordingly he is said to be the Father's Servant: Indeed the Scripture speaks of the Son every where as a distinct Person; to mention but one Place, out of a great many, ** I and my Father, saith Christ, are one.* Which

John x 30.

D

Words

from the SACRED SCRIPTURES. 35

Father and the Son, but the Unity of Essence? The Father, I grant, may be said to be in the Son.

Words plainly imply both an Unity and Plurality: The Plural Verb, *Are*, shews the Nominatives, *I*, and, *my Father*, to be or express, distinct Persons; for had he that spoke, and the Father, of whom, with himself, he spake, been but one and the same Person, the Verb had been Singular, not *are*, but *is*: The Unity is also as obvious as the Plurality, *I and my Father are one* *. The Verb Plural, and the Neutral Noun, undeniably prove a Distinction of Persons, and Unity of Essence: The Word render'd *One*, is not *ēs*, from which some argue, but weakly, that the Most High God is only One Person; but *iv*, which denotes, *One Being and Essence*. So then, Although the Father and Son be distinct Persons, yet they are not separated from each other, as it is among Men: There the Son is not only begotten by, but also separated from his Father; the Begotten among these, has a distinct Essence from that of the Begetter: Though his Essence be derived from his Father, yet is it not the Father's Essence, but really another; so that the Son, among Men, is another Being than his Father: It is not so in the Generation of the Son of God, as it has been open'd; for although the Son and Father, in the Godhead, be distinct Persons, yet have they but one Essence: The Essence of the Son is not another from, but the very Essence of the Father; so that they are One Being, though Two distinct Persons; *I and my Father are One*. The Son therefore, though begotten by the Father, is not separated from him; *As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee*. Not only is the Father in the Son, but the Son also is in the Father; and the Son is in the Father, as the Father is in—; Now what can be the Ground of this mutual In-being between the

* Pearson on the Creed.

† John xvii. 21.

Father and the Son, but the Unity of Essence? The Father, I grant, may be said to be in the Son, because of the Son's coming from the Father, having his Commission, acting by his Authority, working also Miracles by his Power, but surely, on neither of those Accounts can the Son be said to be in the Father; never any dream'd of the Father's acting by Commission from the Son, or Authority deriv'd from him, or working by his Power: As therefore the Son cannot be said to be in the Father in this Sense, the Father's being in the Son, must not here be understood in respect of those Things, for it is the same Thing that's asserted of both, in respect of one another: Now what can be the Ground of this their mutual In-being, but the Unity of Essence? The Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father, because the same infinite divine Essence is in both; and if the Father be in the Son, and the Son in the Father, in this Sense, and upon this Account, then the Son is not by Generation separated from the Father.

4. The Generation of the Son, as open'd above, is a proper, not a metaphorical Generation; tho' it be very different from the human, it is not less proper than that: It's free from all the Defects and Imperfections accompanying the human Generation; but the want of these, can't render it the less proper; surely 'tis not the Defects which accompany natural Generations, that make them properly such. What is Generation, properly speaking, but the communicating of a vital Nature that is in one, unto another? Or, as * some describes it, a vital Production of another in the same Nature, with a full Representation of him by whom he is produc'd. Thus in the human Generation, the hu-

* Pearson.

man Nature, which is vita, is communicated from one Man to another, or one Man produceth another in the same Nature with himself; that Communication, or Production, makes the Person communicating, or producing, properly a Father; and the Person produced, or to whom the Communication is made, properly a Son; now if this be Generation, strictly and properly speaking, then is the Second Person in the Godhead truly and properly begotten of the First; so that the First is properly a Father, and the Second as truly a Son; for in the Generation of the Son, as it is opened, the Father communicates the Divine Essence to another Person, or produceth another Person of the same Nature and Essence with himself: The Denominations, therefore, of Father and Son, used of the first Two Persons of the Sacred Trinity, are not grounded upon their respective Concernment in the Redemption of lost Men; but upon the Relation that ariseth between them, from this proper and necessary Generation: Had God never form'd any Counsels of Peace about fallen Men, there would nevertheless have been Father and Son in the Godhead: Our Redemption supposeth, does not make this Mystery. Yea, the Generation of the Son is not only as proper a Generation, but it is more so, than any natural one; in as much as the Communication of Nature in this, is much more perfect, and the Begetter much more fully represented in the Begotten, than in any natural Generation. And the more perfect the Communication of Nature is, and the more fully that the Begetter is represented in the Begotten, so much the more proper and perfect is the Generation: Now whereas in all natural Generations, the Communication of the Nature is by Derivation, or a Separation of some part of the Begetter's Substance; in the Generation of the Son of God the divine Essence is totally communicated,

so

so that it is not another Essence made of a part of the Father's, that is in the Son; but the same individual Essence which is in the Father: And hence the Son, in the Godhead, represents the Father much more perfectly, and fully, than any Son among Men does his Parent; according to the Description of him open'd already, *viz.* The express Image of the Father's Person. So then, whatever Mystery there is in the Father's begetting a Son in himself, yet as this was most necessary, so the Son's not being separated from the Father, makes his Generation not less, but on the contrary, more proper.

5. This Generation I am considering, is peculiar to the Second Person in the Godhead: Hence he is call'd the only begotten Son; and not, as some vainly imagine, referring the Term only to the Father, because he was begotten of the Father alone. *Socinians* will have Christ call'd the only begotten Son, because he is beloved and honour'd above all others: It's very true, that Christ is beloved of the Father, more than any others, who are call'd Sons of God; but that is not the reason of his having that Name: On the contrary, he is eminently beloved, because he is the only begotten; Unigeniture is the Foundation of that singular Love, not contrariwise: Others are call'd Sons of God, as Magistrates, Professors of the true Religion, Angels, *Adam*, Believers in Christ; but none of these are begotten of God, by such a Generation as this of the Son: Believers are indeed said to be *born of God*; but that must be understood, not in a proper Sense; the Communication of the divine Nature to them in Regeneration, is very different from that we have been speaking of to the Son; so that notwithstanding this, he is still the only Begotten, in a proper Sense. There is another, it's true, to whom the divine Essence is properly and fully communicated,

municated, viz. the Third of the sacred Three, or the Holy Ghost; who is therefore God, the same in Substance, and equal with the Father and the Son; but he is never said to be begotten, but to proceed; and whereas the Communication of the divine Essence to the Son, is from the Father only; the Communication of it to the Holy Ghost, is from both the other; he has the divine Essence, not by Generation, but Procession; so that the Second is the only begotten Son, he only having the divine Nature by a true and proper, a necessary and eternal Generation.

6. Once more let me observe, that in this Generation of the Son, the divine Essence is not made to be; another divine Person is begotten, but not another Essence: The same individual Essence that is in the Father, is made to subsist in another manner. By which we may apprehend, how the Son, notwithstanding that he is begotten, is nevertheless an independent Being; because his Essence is no other than the self-originate, and independent divine Essence, or Essence of the Father: And surely he can't be a dependent Being, whose Essence is independent and self-originate.

2. Having thus given some Account of the Son's Generation, from the Oracles of Truth; I proceed to examine what there is, or whether there be any thing in this Generation, to prove him unequal with, or inferior to the Father, in Power and Glory; or to have an Essence distinct from the Father's: They who are gone from the receiv'd Truth, in this great Article of Faith, think they have all Reason, and the common Sense of Mankind on their Side, while they conclude the Son's Inferiority to the Father, from his being generated of him: As for the Scriptures, they say these cannot contradict Reason; and should there be any Contradiction to Reason in them, they would not believe

believe them to be of divine Original. It's very certain, that the holy Scriptures, being the Word of God, who is perfect Light, tho' they may contain Things that are above the Comprehension of our Reason, yet never do contradict right and perfect Reason; but seeing evangelical and revealed Mysteries may seem unto us to do so, when they really do it not, a little less Assurance would become Men, than commonly is us'd by some on this Head: If a Thing may seem unto us, in our present imperfect Estate, to contradict Reason, and yet not really do so; supposing the Evidence of the divine Original of the Scriptures to be full and indisputable, would it not become us, from the infallible Veracity of God, to conclude those Things which have some appearance of contradicting Reason, to be indeed, only seeming Contradictions; rather than from their having such an appearance, to conclude against the divine Inspiration of the Scriptures? Are there not many Things, that some comprehend very clearly, which yet others, of weaker Reason, look upon as great Absurdities, and Contradictions to Reason? And why may not the former, through the Imperfection of their Reason, judge also some Things absurd, which really are not so? Doubtless, there are Truths as much above their Reason, as some, which they comprehend, are above the weaker Capacities of others. However, I readily grant, that the Scriptures contain nothing that really contradicts perfect Reason: But our Reason, and the common Sense of Mankind, may be stretch'd beyond their proper Limits; and by that means, the greatest Truths may be judg'd absurd. It is an easy matter for Men to make a Cry of Reason, and common Sense, as if themselves were the sole Abettors of either, and others were declar'd Enemies unto both; it is hop'd it will be no Offence to such, that we exercise Reason so far,

as to enquire into the Ground of their Pretensions: And here it may be alledg'd, that Reason, and the Sense of all Men testifies, that he who is begotten, is inferiour to him that begetteth: What else is the Ground of the Honour and Obedience, due from Children to Parents, by the Judgment of all Nations? It is every where own'd to be the Duty of Children, to honour and be obedient unto Parents; that Inferiority necessarily attends, and flows from the Relation of Filiation. Besides, he that begetteth, must in Reason be before him that is begotten; the Cause must precede the Effect; a Father must be older than his Son: And farther, he that is begotten of another, in the Judgment of common Sense and Reason, must depend upon him that begetteth, he is of him, and therefore depends; and if the Begetter is not of any other, he that is begotten by him, can't be equally independent with him. The First Person in the Godhead being neither created, nor begotten, nor yet proceeding from any other, the Second, or the Son, who is of him, can't be equally independent with him: Now if the Father was before the Son, and the latter depends upon the former, whereas he depends upon none; what can be more evident, than that the Son is not equal in Power and Glory, to the Father? Can the Son, that is necessarily after the Father, be co-eternal with him, who is necessarily before him? Or can the Son, that is a dependent Being, and derived from the Father, be equal to him, on whom he dependeth, who is the Source and Fountain of all, and self-originate? Or can the Inferiority that necessarily goes along with Filiation, consist with Equality? Thus then it would seem reasonable, from the Son's being generated, to conclude him unequal to the Father, and of a distinct Essence: And I think I have given the Argument all its Strength; yet by a due Consideration it will be found

found to have only the appearance of Truth, and to be really of no force. In answer therefore to all I say,

1st. It is not the dictate of absolute Reason, that a Son must be necessarily inferior to his Father: For were this a Principle of Reason, why should not one Man's Reason dictate this as well as another's, when his Reason is as good, as free, and as much improv'd as that of another? The Reason of many, and those not contemptible, but very considerable, both for natural and acquir'd Abilities, has not taught them that: Their Reason appears to be nothing inferior to other Men's, yet they never thought that the Son, because he is begotten of the Father, must therefore necessarily be inferior to him: On the contrary they believ'd, that the Son was begotten of the Father, and yet as firmly believ'd him to be equal with him. So that I say this Assertion, *viz.* That the Son, as such, must necessarily be inferior to his Father, is not the dictate of absolute Reason; but is rather a Judgment form'd upon some particular Notions, or from some certain manner of Generation: There's no doubt, but we may form such Conceptions of Generation, as will necessarily imply a Son's Inferiority to his Father, and from such a manner of Generation, Reason and common Sense will proclaim the Son to be unequal to the Father: But we are not to conclude, that a Son, absolutely as such, must be inferior to a Father, because a Son begotten in this or that particular manner, is necessarily so: For there may be a Son begotten not in that, but in a very different manner, which may imply no such thing: And this I take to be the Cause before us, some who assert a new Scheme of Divinity, have formed their Notions of the Son's Generation by what is observable in natural Generations; by observing these, they clearly perceive, that

E

a Son

a Son so begotten must be unequal to his Father; and from this too hastily conclude, that it must be the same in the Divine Generation, which is certainly a wrong way of Reasoning: What! must the eternal Generation of the Son of God be so correspondent unto the humane Generation, as that because it is thus in the one, it must therefore be so in the other? May there not reasonably be thought to be such a difference between the infinite God's begetting a Son, and a poor finite Mortal's begetting one; as that altho' in the one Case, the Son is necessarily unequal and inferior to his Father, yet in the other it may not be so? That altho' in the humane Generation, the Father be necessarily before his Son, and the Son necessarily a dependent Being, yet in the Divine Generation it is not so?

2. Tho' Reason may conclude from Observation what must be in the natural Generation, and must follow upon that, yet it may not judge and determine the Consequences of the Divine Generation: And the Reason of this, in a word, is, that Reason of itself knows nothing of the nature and manner of the Divine Generation; nor would it ever have been able to apprehend that Mystery, or have thought any thing of it, if a positive Revelation had not made it known: How should bare Reason assure us of the Consequences of the Son of God's Generation, when it knows nothing of that Mystery, or how he is begotten? Unless Men will take upon them, by their weak and imperfect Reason, to set Bounds to the Infinite God, and say that it is impossible for him to beget a Son equal to himself: Yet if any do thus limit Omnipotence, the Arrogance of it will fully justify the withholding of our Assent from such a presumptuous Assertion. If we'll form our Conceptions of the Son's Generation from Scripture, and judge of the Consequences from what the sacred Oracles reveal of it, Reason

son will not from those Conceptions draw such an Inference ; and if we form not our Conceptions thereof by the Word, we do but wander in Darkness, and must lose our selves. Reason and the common Sense of Men say indeed, that the Man, who begetteth another, must be in Being before that other ; and that he, who is begotten of another, must be inferior to that other : But Reason cannot say that the blessed God must be before his Son, that is begotten of him ; it does not say that the Second Person in the Godhead, who is begotten of the First, must be inferior to the First : I say, absolute Reason does not, cannot say this, because it says nothing about that Mystery at all. To pretend to judge, and determine by bare Reason, what must follow upon the Son of God's Generation, is to extend Reason beyond its Bounds. Bare Reason can judge only of natural things : It's true, that when any Mystery is reveal'd, tho' Reason knew nothing of it before such Revelation, it may then judge of the same ; but then we are to take heed, that whatsoever Judgment Reason forms about such a Mystery, it be grounded upon the Revelation, that only made it known. The Scripture has taught us, that the Second Person in the Godhead is begotten by the First ; but now our Reason must not from that only, infer that the Second is inferior to the First, because such an Inference supposeth some Acquaintance with the manner of the Son's Generation, which if the Scripture reveal not, Reason can know nothing of. And seeing bare Reason knows nothing of the manner of the Divine Generation, it cannot determine the Consequences thereof. The manner of the Son's Generation may be very different from that of the natural Generation, as most certainly it is : There are many Imperfections in the humane, that the Divine Generation must necessarily be free from ; and what if

this should be one of them, viz. That he who is begotten, must be inferior to him that begetteth ? Or who can tell what a difference in this respect, the freedom from all the Imperfections accompanying the humane Generation, may make between this and the Generation of the Son of God ? Reason must examine and search the Word, to see if it gives any Account, or what Account it gives of that Mystery, and according to that must judge of the Consequences : And if the Scripture Account of the Son's Generation is attended unto, it will not from that appear to be contrary to Reason, for the Son, tho' begotten of the Father, to be equal to him.

3. I deny that it follows from the Scripture Account of the Son's Generation, that the Father was in being before him ; because the Son was not begotten by a voluntary, but a necessary and essential Act of the Father : In voluntary Productions the Cause must be in being before the Effect ; but it is not so in those Productions that are necessary : The Sun is the Cause of our Light, and yet none will pretend to say that the Sun was in being before the Light ; The Light of the Sun, and the Sun itself, were certainly coeval ; as soon as there was a Sun, there was Light proceeding from it ; and the reason is, that it shines necessarily : So that the Cause is not always necessarily in being before the Effect ; for as to natural or necessary Causes it is otherwise, the Effect will, yea must be coeval with the Cause. So in the Generation of the Son of God, it being a necessary and essential Act of the Father, by which the Son is begotten, as that Act must be Co-eternal with the Father, so likewise must the Son. The Father never did begin to generate, but was a Father from all Eternity ; the Son therefore must be begotten, and must have existed from all Eternity ; and altho' begotten of the Father,

Father, yet is Co-eternal with him. The Generation of the Son of God, as it has been open'd from the Scripture, is as necessary as the Emanations of Light from the Sun: Surely it is as essential to the blessed God to comprehend his infinite Self, as to the Sun to illuminate; that God could no more be without a perfect Comprehension of himself, than the Sun without Illumination, or Emanations of Light; yea, of the two, the first is the highest Impossibility; God's perfect Comprehension of himself is more necessary than Emanations of Light from the Sun; no natural Causes can produce their Effects so necessarily as the Divine Mind comprehends himself; for altho' the Effects of necessary Agents naturally follow necessarily upon the being of such Causes, yet by the extraordinary Power of God, that Power which ordained universal Nature, and is superior to all natural Causes, such Effects may be and have been suspended: Fire necessarily burns what is combustible, and yet we read of a very violent * Fire that for some time did not so. The Sun naturally illuminates; nevertheless there was a time when there was a † Sun in the Heavens, and Darkness too over all the Earth; the God of Nature restrained in those Cases, the Agency of those naturally very necessary Causes: But what superior Power should hinder the necessary and essential Act of the Divine Mind comprehending his infinite Self? God himself who can restrain the Agency, and suspend the Effects of all natural Causes, the most necessary of 'em, can't suspend that Act of his own Mind, being the necessary consequent of his absolute Perfection; and certainly what flows necessarily from the absolute Perfection of God, is more necessary than what flows from, and

* Dan. iii. 25.

† Matt. xxvii. 45.

is grounded only upon the Constitution of natural Causes; because, as has been said, he that fram'd universal Nature, can doubtless put a bar to the Agency of any natural Agents. The absolute Perfection of God makes it necessary for him to comprehend himself; He must cease to be absolutely perfect, cease to be God if he did not comprehend himself: So that the Generation of the Son, which is the blessed God's full and perfect comprehending himself, is more necessary than Emanations of Light from the Sun: And seeing the Sun, tho' the Cause of Light, was not in being before the Light which proceeds from it; but there was Light from the Sun coeval with it: I say, seeing it is so, it will not follow that the first Person in the adorable Trinity, must be in being before the second, from this, *viz.* that the latter is begotten of the former; because the second Person was begotten by a necessary and essential Act of the first: And that more necessary than Emanations of Light from the Sun; an Act which an absolutely perfect Being could not be without; which therefore must be co-eternal with him, and by consequence the Son must be begotten from all Eternity, and co-eternal with the Father. Reason and the common Sense of Men tell us, that in humane Generations the begetter is in being before, and must be older than he that is begotten; because such Generations are voluntary; supposing a free determination of the Will. From this it seems some form their Notions of the Generation of the Son of God, which surely ought not to be done: This is so vastly different from the other, that we can't argue from the one to the other: Were there no more difference known between them but this, that the one is necessary, and the other voluntary, that were enough to spoil the Consequence of the Argument from the one to the other, and hinder inferring that God the Father must

must be in being before the Son, that is begotten of him ; because in humane Generations, he that begetteth is necessarily in being before the Son whom he begetteth : It might as justly be infer'd, that because a Candle must be made before it gives Light, therefore the Sun also must have been in being before any Light proceeded from it ; which any one may easily see the Fallacy of, inasmuch as a Candle might be made and yet not give light, its illuminating depending upon the voluntary Act of some free Agent : Whereas the Sun gives Light from its Nature : In like manner, whereas there is no humane Generation but what might never have been ; the Generation of the second Person in the Godhead is from the Nature of God, and as necessary as his very Being : Now what is the necessary Consequent of the Divine Nature, must have been as long as that Nature has existed, *i. e.* as the Divine Nature was from all Eternity, there was also Divine Generation ; and seeing the Generation of the Son is co-eternal with the Divine Nature, the Son must be co-eternal with the Father, tho' begotten of him.

4. Neither will it follow from the Scripture Account of the Son's Generation, that he is a dependent Being, and in that respect inferior to the Father : Were his Generation such as that of Men, he must unavoidably be Dependent ; for among Men, every Son depends for his Being upon him that begetteth ; but, as I said already, the Generation of the Son of God is very different from the humane ; every Son among Men derives his Nature from another, it is made from and of another, which is likewise a dependent Nature, subsisting in and by another, not of and by itself ; whereas the Son of God hath not a made Nature, or an Essence made from and out of the Father's, but the very self originate Essence and Nature of the Father :
Now,

Now, such as his Essence and Nature is, such a Being he is to be esteem'd: And seeing that his Essence is an independent one, that subsisteth not by any other, but of itself, he must be an independent Being: In the Divine Generation another Person is begotten, but no other Nature is made: The very same Essence of the Father subsisteth thereby in a different manner than in the Father: That perfect Self-comprehension in God, which is the second Person, hath in it the very Essence of God, the one independent Self-originate, and absolutely perfect Essence, subsisting in another manner than in the first; for the infinite God comprehends himself not by an Act distinct from, but by his Essence, of which the best Conception we can form, is, That it is a most perfect Act. The Son's Essence therefore must be independent, being the numerical Essence of the Father. He has Life in himself, as was noted before, and not in any other. And if he hath Life in himself, he must have it independently; and so; by having that absolutely perfect Essence, which is the Source and Fountain of Life, or original Life. He hath Life in himself, tho' it is given him to have Life in himself: Life is in the Son, as in its prime Original and Fountain, as well as in the Father: Altho' it is of the Father, that it is so in the Son. Here is a very great Mystery; but that these are consistent, I conclude from this, *viz.* That they are joyn'd together in the Scriptures of Truth; certainly these do not joyn together what are really inconsistent: And where should Life be independently, but in the Fountain of it? We have Life in us, so hath Christ; but can any Man say, or dare any of us pretend, that we have Life in our selves, as is said of Christ? And why cannot this be said of us, or of any living thing, but because it imports Independency? Whereas the Life of all Creatures depends

pend upon God ; in him we live or have Life, not in our selves. The contrary belongs to the Son of God, who hath the Fountain and Original of Life, the Infinite Divine Essence in him : That Life is absolutely his own ; whereas the Life that is in every dependent Being, is not absolutely his in whom it is, but is more his on whom it depends. Surely his Life is absolutely his own, who has Life in himself ; and if Life be absolutely his own, he must have Life independently, and therefore be an independent Being. Moreover, every dependent Being is nothing in itself, subsisting wholly in, and deriving all from another, having nothing but what is more another's than its own ; it is in a sense nothing in itself. Now, what Christian is he that does not tremble at the Thought of ascribing this unto, or asserting it of the Son of God, viz. That he is nothing in himself ? He has said that he hath Life in himself ; and shall we dare to say that he is a nothing in himself ? Besides, as all dependent Beings are in a sense nothing in themselves, so they are originally nothing, or were once nothing at all, every dependent Being is a mere Creature : The reason of this is, that a dependent Being, is but the Effect of the Power and Sovereign Pleasure or Will of him whom he depends upon ; and that which is only the effect of the Will and Power of another, must be originally nothing ; for if it were any thing antecedent to the exercise of that other's Power, it would not be only the effect of his Power, and so far not dependent upon him : A Creature therefore, and a dependent Being are synonymous Terms ; that if the Son, or second Person in the Godhead, is a dependent Being, he must be no more than a Creature, only of an higher Order than any other : He was, on this Supposition, made of nothing, as well as Men and Angels, and all other created Beings : This the old *Arians* asserted, tho' but few of our

new ones yet care for maintaining. Upon the whole it is evident, that the second Person in the Godhead is an independent Being; and that the contrary follows not from his Generation; he subsisteth not in another any more than the Father; and how should he, seeing his Essence is Self-originate, the very same with that of the Father? Thus, I hope, the Argument for the Son's Inequality with the Father, from his being begotten of him, is fully enervated, and it is made appear, that the Son's Generation, as taught us in the Sacred Oracles, does not imply his Inferiority to his Father, or any thing which necessarily proves that.

3. The contrary follows from it, as I'll now proceed to shew, *viz.* Because the second Person is begotten of the first, he must therefore necessarily be equal with him in Power and Glory, and of the same Essence: It is not possible that the Infinite God should beget a Son unequal to himself; however it be in natural and humane Generations, when the most High begetteth, it can't be so. I have already observ'd, that the Generation of the Son of God is a proper, not a metaphorical one; that the first Person in the Godhead is properly and truly a Father, and the second as truly and properly a Son; yea, as I have hinted also, and will farther appear by what follows, That the Son's Generation is so far from being only a Metaphor, that it is of all the most proper, even more so than any natural Generation: He is as properly begotten as any Son among Men. It will likewise without dispute, be allow'd, that the Generation of the Son of God was a most perfect one, and altogether free from any thing that would imply Imperfection in God: How much soever we are in the dark as to the manner of that Generation, this is certain, *viz.* that it is such as implies no Imperfection: So that whatsoever there is in the humane
Gene-

Generation, that supposeth, proceeds from, or necessarily implies humane Imperfection, that must be remov'd from, and not imagin'd to agree to the Divine, because every thing of that Nature is inconsistent with the absolute Perfection of the blessed God. Taking these Suppositions for granted, it may be prov'd, without much difficulty, that the Son of God as such, or because he is begotten of, must be equal with the Father ; for, in all proper Generations, the begotten must be of the Substance, and have the Nature of him that begetteth ; and then if one Person is of the Substance, and hath the Nature of another, it must be either by having something of the other's Substance separated from him, of which the begotten is made ; or else by a total Communication of the Begetter's Essence : The first of these ways implying Imperfection, cannot be that in which the Son of God is begotten : So that if the second Person in the Godhead is properly begotten of the First, the whole Essence of the Father must be communicated unto him ; and if the whole Essence of the Father is in the Son, then all the Power and Glory that is essential to the first, must belong to the second ; and so the latter must be no way inferior unto, but perfectly equal with the former in Power and Glory. To consider these things at some more length.

1. I say where there is a proper Generation, as is that of the Son of God, he who is begotten is of the Substance of him that begetteth ; which is evident in all natural Generations ; the begotten hath not only the same specifick Nature with, but is made of the Substance of the Begetter : Hence * *Levi* is said to be in the Loins of his Father

* Heb. vii. 10.

Abraham, when he paid Tithes to *Melchisedeck*. Generation is not the bare producing of one thing by another, unless the thing produced be formed out of the Substance of the thing producing; there is a real and great difference between the proper Generation, and the bare Formation of a thing; which lies in this, *viz.* What is properly generated, is, as has been said, of the Substance of that which generates; whereas it is not so in bare Formation: God is the Former of all Men, and yet we are not upon the account of the natural Formation, said to be generated or begotten of him. Nor is the Production of one thing by another proper Generation, altho' the produced be of the same specifick Nature with the Producer, unless the former be of the Substance of the latter; for if it be not, such a Production will be really Creation. The second Person in the Godhead then being properly begotten of the first, is not only another produc'd by the Power of the first, and of the like Nature with him; for so he would be created, not begotten; but is of the Substance, and hath the Essence of the first in him; which cannot be denied without denying his proper Generation: And therefore some, who have departed from the receiv'd Truth, are constrain'd to own, that the Son is of the Substance of the Father: which Concession does really subvert their Scheme: However herein we are agreed, and I am glad the Truth prevails so far, as to extort a Concession from them, so advantageous to the Establishment of what they are against. But to proceed,

2. If one Person be of the Substance of another, it must either be by being made of some part of the other's Substance, separated from him, or by the entire Communication of the other's Essence: There is no third way imaginable whereby one Person can be of the Substance of another: And therefore all
Genera-

Generation, properly so call'd, must be in one or other of these ways : In natural and creature Generations it is always the first — : The generated is a part of his Substance who begetteth : Indeed it cannot be in the other, — by reason of the Imperfection of all created Natures and Essences, which cannot subsist two different ways ; I mean the same numerical finite Nature, or Essence, cannot subsist in two Persons, and that because it is a finite Nature : So that all natural and creature Generations, being of finite Beings, are necessarily by a Separation of some part of the Begetter's Substance, whereof the begotten is made. But in the Divine Generation it may at least be otherwise, *viz.* By an entire Communication of the Begetter's Essence ; for the Divine Essence being infinite, may numerically subsist in distinct Persons ; tho' the same numerical finite Nature cannot do so. Now, seeing the Son of God must necessarily have the Nature, and be of the Substance of the Father, he must either be made of some part of the Father's Substance, or have it entirely communicated unto him : This then is to be enquir'd into, *viz.* which of these ways the second Person in the Godhead is begotten ? And altho' the Generation of the Son be, in a great measure, incomprehensible to us, and inexplicable ; yet thus far we may in the general determine about it : Nor shall we here need much assistance from Revelation ; for if it appears that one of the said ways of Generation is more agreeable to the Divine Nature than the other, and that one of 'em is inconsistent with the Perfection of God, we may, yea, we must conclude it to be the other ; which will be found to be the Case ; for as the one cannot agree to creature and natural Generations, because of the Perfection of it, and the necessary Imperfection of all created Beings ; so the other cannot agree to the blessed God, because of its

Imper-

Imperfection, utterly inconsistent with his absolute Perfection.

3. I say then, that the Son of God is not begotten by the Separation of any part of the Father's Substance, as that whereof he is formed : Such a manner of Generation is not consistent with the Divine Nature and Perfection, in that it would imply Divisibility and Composition in the Divine Essence, yea, Mutability likewise ; besides, it is a Denial of God's essential Fulness. 1. Were the Son form'd of any part of the Father's Substance separated from him, the Father's Substance must be divisible and made up of distinct Parts ; for if the Father's Essence be not made up of Parts, how should the Son be form'd of some part of it ? If it is not divisible, how can that whereof the Son is suppos'd to be made, be separated from the rest ? In all Generations, where the begotten is formed of a part of the Begetter's Substance, the Substance of such Begetter is divisible and compounded ; and so no doubt must the Divine Nature be, if the Son be thus begotten : And therefore I conclude it cannot be so, because the Essence of God is necessarily indivisible, and a most simple and uncompounded one. The Perfection of God is proof enough of this, and requires that it be so ; the more simple and less compounded any Nature is, the more perfect is that Nature. Absolute Perfection then must imply absolute Simplicity ; or the Divine Essence, which is absolutely perfect, must be absolutely simple, and altogether without Composition ; and by consequence is not capable of Division, and cannot be communicated in part, but must, if at all, be communicated entirely : So then, either the absolute Simplicity of the Divine Essence must be denied, or it must be acknowledged that the Son is not begotten by a Separation of some part of the Father's Substance. Nor can the absolute Simplicity of the
Divine

Divine Essence be given up, without quitting likewise God's absolute Perfection. Suppose the Divine Essence to be made up of Parts ; either each of those Parts is absolutely perfect, or not : If the first be affirmed, then there will be as many absolutely perfect Beings, as there are Parts in the Divine Essence ; which is absurd : If it be said that the Parts of the supposed, compounded Divine Essence, are not singly, absolutely perfect, then either God is not absolutely perfect, or absolute Perfection must be made up of Parts not absolutely perfect, which is likewise absurd. Seeing then a compounded Essence of an absolutely perfect Being cannot be suppos'd, without one or other of these Absurdities following upon it, *viz.* A plurality of Beings absolutely perfect, or absolute and infinite Perfection made up of imperfect Parts, such an Essence must itself be an Absurdity, and cannot belong to an absolutely perfect Being : That if God be absolutely perfect, his Essence must be absolutely simple, altogether without Parts : And therefore the Son cannot be of the Substance of the Father, by a partial Communication of his Essence unto him.

2. Such a Generation is inconsistent with God's Immutability, as well as Simplicity: that God is immutable in his Essence, is acknowledg'd by all ; St. James has taught us, that ** there is no Variableness in him, nor so much as the Shadow of Change.* Surely he must be so in his Nature and Essence, if he is so at all: Indeed that Nature, which is eternal, can't but be immutable: God is now what he ever was ; and ever was the same, he will be for ever: the most simple, and absolutely perfect divine Essence, is self existent, and a self existent Essence must be unchangeable: Whatsoever God

is, he is necessarily and essentially; and seeing he is necessarily what he is, he can undergo no Variation: The absolute Perfection of the divine Nature likewise proves its Immutability; that which is absolutely perfect can't be chang'd to greater Perfection, for nothing can exceed it; whatsoever is chang'd into greater Perfection, was plainly not so perfect before, as it becomes by such a Change, and therefore not absolutely perfect; and to be changeable into less Perfection is certainly an Imperfection, that cannot agree to what is absolutely perfect: The Divine Essence then is surely altogether immutable. But now does it comport with this absolute Immutability of God's Essence, for the Son to be begotten by such a Generation as I am speaking of? If the Son is made of a part of the Father's Substance, the Essence of the latter must surely be thereby chang'd; for how can a part of his Substance be made another Person, and he still remain altogether the same he was? Is not that evidently changed which has some part of it separated from itself, and made another Person of? None, I think, can doubt, but that every Generation of this sort, necessarily implies a change in the Begetter; so that if the Divine Essence be immutable, as most certainly it is, the Son, or the second Person in the Godhead, could not be begotten in such a way.

3. Generation by the separation of some part of the Begetter's Substance, is inconsistent with the essential Fulness of God: By such a Generation he that begetteth, loseth something of himself, even that whereof the Begotten is made: But surely it is an absurd Imagination to think that the blessed God should lose any thing of himself, or of his Substance, by begetting his Son; were it so, what would become of his essential Fulness? Could he remain full, when something of him is separated? Would not his Fulness be undeniably thereby impair'd?

pair'd? Is it possible that something of the Father's Essence should go forth from him, and he notwithstanding remain as full as before? but certainly the essential Fullness of God can by no means be impair'd; and therefore it is not possible that the Son should be begotten in this way, by a Separation of some part of the Father's Substance. On such a supposition the Part, or Emanation from the Father, of which the Son is form'd, would be, either, as perfect as that Essence from which it was, or not; it must be one, or other; no medium can be devis'd between these two; now whether the one or other of these is affirm'd, Absurdities will follow thereupon; and therefore the supposition, from which such Absurdities arise, must be also absurd; if the suppos'd Emanation is said to be as perfect as the Essence from which it is, that would be to assert, that a part is as perfect as the whole: and if it be said, that the Emanation from the Father, of which the Son is made, is not so perfect, as the Essence of which it is a part; this will imply, that there was something in God not absolutely perfect, even that Emanation whereof the Son, on this supposition, is form'd; yea that the infinitely perfect God is made up of Parts, not absolutely perfect; which are Absurdities great enough; and being the direct, and natural Consequences of such a Generation of the Son of God, as I am disproving, do sufficiently prove that he cannot be so begotten: Were the Son really thus generated, nothing but Truth, no Absurdities, would follow from it. And seeing the Son does not partake of the Father's Substance in this way, *viz.* by any Emanation, or Part of his Essence, whereof the Son is made, being separated from the Father, and that the Son of God could not be begotten after this manner, then

4. He must be generated by an entire Commu-
 nication of the Father's Essence unto him: He
 must be of the Substance of the Father, other-
 wise he would not be begotten of him; and as
 there are but these two ways in which the Son
 can be imagined to be, or to partake of the Es-
 sence of the Father, if he does it not in the for-
 mer, which I have prov'd can't be, because incon-
 sistent with the absolute Perfection of the Divine
 Nature, he must then have the whole Essence com-
 municated to him; which agrees entirely with
 what the sacred Text asserts of Christ, *viz.* that
 * *all the Fullness of the Godhead dwells in him bodily.*
 This Proof will continue good until some third
 possible way of the Son's partaking or being of
 the Substance of the Father is made appear. And
 if the Son has the whole Essence of the Father
 communicated unto him, what Perfection, or Glo-
 ry can he want which is in the Father? There is
 no Glory, or Power in the Father, but what is
 essential to him, or in him by his Essence; seeing
 then the Son hath his Essence entirely, all the Glo-
 ry, and Power that is essential to the one, must be
 essential to the other: If the very same Essence
 that is in the Father, be in the Son, or the Es-
 sence of the Father be the Essence of the Son like-
 wise, wherein can the latter be inferior to the for-
 mer? How is it possible, but that he should be
 equal with him in Glory, and Perfections? Can
 any imagine that the immutable, infinite, divine
 Essence is less perfect in the Son, than in the Fa-
 ther? The divine Essence is not multiplied by the
 Generation of the Son, or the Procession of the
 Holy Ghost; tho' there are three divine Persons,
 there's not a Plurality of divine Essences; the same

* Col. 2. 9.

nume-

numerical Essence is in all the three: there are no more divine Essences than if there were but one Person; and can the same Essence, which is necessarily immutable, have less Glory and Perfection, subsisting in the Son, than it hath, as subsisting in the Father? Upon the whole then the Son of God, or second Person in the Godhead, must be equal with the first, because he is begotten of him; for he can't be properly begotten of the first, unless he have the whole divine Essence communicated to him; and if the whole Essence of the Father be in the Son, then all the Glory and Power that's essential to the Father, is also essential to the Son; and having all the Glory and Power that is in the Father, how can he be but equal with him? So that we must deny the Son's Generation by the Father, if we deny his Equality with him; or if we assert that he has another Essence inferior to the Father's; and must say, that he's made, or created, but not begotten: for being begotten, as the Scripture assures us he is, he must be of the Father's Substance; which he cannot be, without having the whole Essence of the Father; and having the whole Essence of the Father, he can't but be equal with him in Power and Glory. Here, then, after all the Obscurity and Sublimeness of this Mystery, is a firm Argument for the Truth, and which, I think, Persons of ordinary Capacities may apprehend; would any prove the Son's Equality with the Father? It may be done thus: He is equal with the Father, that is properly begotten of him: the second Person in the Godhead is properly begotten of the First: He is therefore equal with the First. The major Proposition, or this, He is equal with the Father that is properly begotten of him; is prov'd thus. He that's properly begotten of the Father, partakes of the Father's Substance and Essence: but he that partakes of his Essence, must be equal

equal with him; and therefore he that is begotten of the Father is equal with him. The first Proposition in this Syllogism, or this, He that's properly begotten of the Father partakes of his Essence or Substance, is evident from the Nature of Generation: and the second, or minor, *viz.* this, He that partakes of the Essence of the Father, must be equal with him; is made out thus: None can be of the Essence, or Substance of the Father, unless he have the whole Essence of the Father communicated to him: but he that hath the Father's Essence entirely communicated to him, is necessarily equal with him: the second Person therefore in the Godhead being properly begotten of, is necessarily equal to the First. Or briefly it is prov'd thus: The Son is equal with the Father in Power and Glory; because being begotten of the Father, he necessarily has the entire Essence of the Father in him.

And now, I think, it hath been made appear, that not only the Son's Generation does not imply his Inferiority to the Father in Glory and Power; but likewise that the contrary Truth follows from it; inasmuch as the Son's being begotten of the Father does not prove, that the Father was before him, as hath been shewn; because the Generation of the Son is a necessary, essential, and eternal Act of the Father's; so that he, who is begotten, is coeternal with him that begetteth. Again, the Son's being begotten does not make him a dependent Being; because it is the same independent self-existent Essence, subsisting in a different manner, in the Father, that is in the Son: Surely he ought not to be accounted a dependent Being, whose Essence is eternal, and self-originate. Moreover the Son's being generated of the Father, does not imply that he has another Essence distinct from that of the Father: If that were the case, he must necessarily be infinitely inferior to the Father; every
Essence,

Essence, distinct from that of the Most High, is finite, whereas the Essence of the blessed God is infinite; and between finite, and infinite, there is an infinite distance: The Son's Generation implies the contrary, as I have prov'd, *viz.* that the very Essence of the Father is entirely communicated to him; and by consequence, all the Glory and Power essential to the Father belongs likewise unto, and is inherent in him.

F I N I S.



Publish'd by the same AUTHOR.

The Son's Equality with the Father, prov'd from his being the Object of Religious Worship: In a Discourse on *Heb. i. 6.* Price 6 *d.*





Lately printed for JOHN CLARK.

I. **T**HE Church and Dissenters compared, as to Persecution; In some Remarks on Dr. *Walker's* Attempt to recover the Names and Sufferings of the Clergy that were sequestred, &c. between 1640 and 1660. By the Reverend *Edmund Calamy*, D. D. Price 1 s.

II. A Defence of the Dissenters, in Answer to Dr. *Nichol's* Defence of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of *England*: In three Parts. I. Containing the History of Nonconformity. II. Relating to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. III. Concerning Discipline and Modes of Worship. By Mr. *James Peirce*, 8vo. Price 5 s.

III. The Psalms of *David* imitated in the Language of the New Testament, and apply'd to the Christian State and Worship. By the Reverend Mr. *Isaac Watts*. The second Edition 12mo. Price 1 s. 6 d.

IV. The History of *New England*, being an impartial Account of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Country, with a new and accurate Map thereof: To which is added, an *Appendix*, containing their present Charter, their Ecclesiastical Discipline, and their Municipal Laws. By the Reverend Mr. *Daniel Neal*: In two Tolumes 8vo. Price 8 s.

V. The

